arXiv:1304.3372v1 [math.NA] 11 Apr 2013

The Curse of Dimensionality for Numerical Integration of Smooth Functions II

Aicke Hinrichs, Erich Novak[*], Mario Ullrich[†]
Mathematisches Institut, Universität Jena
Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany
email: a.hinrichs@uni-jena.de, erich.novak@uni-jena.de

Henryk Woźniakowski[‡]
Department of Computer Science, Columbia University,
New York, NY 10027, USA, and
Institute of Applied Mathematics, University of Warsaw
ul. Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland
email: henryk@cs.columbia.edu

April 12, 2013

Abstract

We prove the curse of dimensionality in the worst case setting for numerical integration for a number of classes of smooth d-variate functions. Roughly speaking, we consider different bounds for the derivatives of $f \in C^k(D_d)$ and ask whether the curse of dimensionality holds for the respective classes of functions. We always assume that $D_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has volume one and consider various values of k including the case $k = \infty$ which corresponds to infinitely many differentiable functions. We obtain necessary and sufficient conditions, and in some cases a full characterization for the curse of dimensionality. For infinitely many differentiable functions we prove the curse if the bounds

---

[*] This author was partially supported by the DFG-Priority Program 1324.
[†] This author was partially supported by DFG GRK 1523.
[‡] This author was partially supported by the National Science Foundation.

on the successive derivatives are appropriately large. The proof technique is based on a volume estimate of a neighborhood of the convex hull of n points which decays exponentially fast if n is small relative to d. For $k = \infty$, we also also study conditions for quasi-polynomial, weak and uniform weak tractability.

1 Introduction

We study the problem of numerical integration, i.e. of approximating the integral

$$S_d(f) = \int_{D_d} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{1}$$

over an open subset $D_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of Lebesgue measure $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$ for integrable functions $f\colon D_d \to \mathbb{R}$. In particular, we consider the case of *smooth* integrands. The main interest is on the behavior of the minimal number of function values that are needed in the worst case setting to achieve an error at most $\varepsilon > 0$, while the dimension d tends to infinity. Note that classical examples of domains D_d are the unit cube $[0,1]^d$ and the normalized Euclidean ball (with volume 1), which are closed. However, we work with their interiors for definiteness of certain derivatives. Obviously, this does not change the integration problem.

For arbitrary sequences $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$, we prove that numerical integration suffers from the *curse of dimensionality* for certain classes of smooth functions with suitable bounds on the Lipschitz constant that depend on d. The curse of dimensionality means that the minimal number of function evaluations is exponentially large in d. This paper is a continuation of our paper [7] with the following new results:

- We use nontrivial volume estimates, see Theorem 2.1 and 2.3.
- We obtain matching lower and upper bounds for Lipschitz functions, see Theorem 3.1.
- We obtain matching lower and upper bounds for functions with a Lipschitz gradient, see Theorem 4.1.
- We provide better lower and upper bounds than in [7] for functions with higher smoothness, see Theorem 5.1.
- We obtain results for C^∞ functions, see Theorem 6.1 and 7.1. In particular, in this case we study quasi-polynomial, weak and uniform weak tractability.

We always assume that $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$ but, in addition, we need further assumptions on D_d, like convexity and/or bounds on the radius of D_d.

Technical tools used in this paper include:

- Bounds for the volume of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \operatorname{dist}(x, K) \le \gamma\}$, where K is the convex hull of n points, and dist is the Euclidean distance of a point x from K, see Theorem 2.1 and 2.3.
- Properties of the convolution derived mainly in [7], see Theorem 2.4.

2 Preliminaries and Tools

2.1 Complexity

In this section we precisely define our problem. Let F_d be a class of continuous integrable functions $f : D_d \to \mathbb{R}$. For $f \in F_d$, we approximate the integral $S_d(f)$, see (1), by algorithms

$$A_{n,d}(f) = \phi_{n,d}(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n)),$$

where $x_j \in D_d$ can be chosen adaptively and $\phi_{n,d} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary mapping. Adaption means that the selection of x_j may depend on the already computed values $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_{j-1})$. The (worst case) error of the algorithm $A_{n,d}$ is defined as

$$e(A_{n,d}) = \sup_{f \in F_d} |S_d(f) - A_{n,d}(f)|.$$

Then the information complexity $n(\varepsilon, F_d)$ is the minimal number of function values which is needed to guarantee that the error is at most ε, i.e.,

$$n(\varepsilon, F_d) = \min\{\, n \mid \ \exists\ A_{n,d} \ \text{ such that } \ e(A_{n,d}) \le \varepsilon\}.$$

Hence, we minimize n over all choices of adaptive sample points x_j and mappings $\phi_{n,d}$. It is well known that as long as the class F_d is convex and symmetric we may restrict the minimization of n by considering only nonadaptive choices of x_j and linear mappings $\phi_{n,d}$. Furthermore, in this case we have

$$n(\varepsilon, F_d) = \min\{\, n \mid \inf_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in D_d} \ \sup_{f \in F_d,\ f(x_j)=0,\, j=1,2,\dots,n} |S_d(f)| \le \varepsilon\}.$$

In this paper we always consider convex and symmetric F_d so that we can use the last formula for $n(\varepsilon, F_d)$. It is also well known that for convex and symmetric F_d the total complexity, i.e., the minimal cost of computing an ε approximation insignificantly differs from the information complexity. For more details see, for instance, Chapter 4 in [10].

By the *curse of dimensionality* we mean that $n(\varepsilon, F_d)$ is exponentially large in d. That is, there are positive numbers c, ε_0 and γ such that

$$n(\varepsilon, F_d) \geq c\,(1+\gamma)^d \quad \text{for all} \quad \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0 \ \text{ and infinitely many } \ d \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2}$$

There are many classes F_d for which the curse of dimensionality has been proved for numerical integration and other multivariate problems, see [10, 12] for such examples. In this paper we continue our work from [7].

2.2 Function Classes

Already in [7] we considered classes of functions with bounds on the Lipschitz constants of all successive directional derivatives up to some order r. This will also be one of the main smoothness assumptions in this paper. To make clear why this is a natural assumption we now comment on the relation between usual and directional derivatives in terms of norms of higher derivatives viewed as multilinear functionals. To this end, let $\Omega \in \big\{D_d, \mathbb{R}^d\big\}$ and let $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be an r-times continuously differentiable function. We denote the class of r-times continuously differentiable functions on Ω by $C^r(\Omega)$. The corresponding classes of infinitely differentiable functions are similarly denoted for $r = \infty$.

For $k = 1, \ldots, r$, the k-th derivative $f^{(k)}(x)$ at a point $x \in \Omega$ is naturally considered as a symmetric k-linear map $f^{(k)}(x)\colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^k \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, let $D^\theta f(x) = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h}\big(f(x+h\theta_1) - f(x)\big)$ be the derivative in direction θ. For example, in the case $k=2$ the second derivative is the bilinear map defined by the Hessian.

For $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, the successive directional derivative in the directions $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$ is then given as

$$D^{\theta_k} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f(x) = f^{(k)}(x)(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k)$$

and is independent of the ordering of the derivatives.

The norm of such a k-linear map $A : (\mathbb{R}^d)^k \to \mathbb{R}$ is given as

$$\|A\| = \sup\big\{|A(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k)| \;\big|\; \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}\big\}.$$

Since the polarization constant of a Hilbert space equals one, see [3, Proposition 1.44], this norm is also equal to

$$\|A\| = \sup\big\{|A(\theta, \ldots, \theta)| \;\big|\; \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}\big\}.$$

For $k \leq r$ and $f \in C^r(\Omega)$, let us denote

$$\|f^{(k)}\| = \|f^{(k)}\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in\Omega} \|f^{(k)}(x)\|$$

and

$$\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(k)}) = \sup_{x,y\in\Omega, x\neq y} \frac{\|f^{(k)}(x) - f^{(k)}(y)\|}{\|x-y\|_2}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(k)}) = \sup_{\theta_1,\dots,\theta_k\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathrm{Lip}(D^{\theta_1}\dots D^{\theta_k} f) = \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathrm{Lip}(D^{\theta}\dots D^{\theta} f).$$

Moreover, for $k < r$ we have

$$\|f^{(k+1)}\| = \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(k)}).$$

If we need to emphasize the domain Ω in these notations, we will write $\|f|_\Omega\|$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(f|_\Omega)$. As usual, $f^{(0)} = f$ in the case $k = 0$ with

$$\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in\Omega} |f(x)|.$$

We will use these facts without further comment.

We now describe the function classes we consider in this paper. The functions shall be defined on Ω. To make lower bounds for the information complexity as strong as possible, the function class should be as small as possible. Analogously, to make upper bounds as strong as possible, the function class should be as large as possible. That is why we use two kinds of function classes. For lower bounds, we require bounds for the Lipschitz constants of certain directional derivatives.

To make this precise, fix a $r \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and a double sequence

$$L = (L_{j,d})_{j\leq r, d\in\mathbb{N}}$$

of positive numbers. Now we define the function classes

$$C_d^r(L) \;=\; \big\{ f \in C^r(D_d) \;\big|\; \|f\|_\infty \leq 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}) \leq L_{j,d} \text{ for all } j \leq r \big\}, \tag{3}$$

and

$$\overline{C}_d^r(L) \;=\; \big\{ f|_{D_d} \;\big|\; f \in C^r(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \|f\|_\infty \leq 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}) \leq L_{j,d} \text{ for all } j \leq r \big\}.$$

Obviously,

$$\overline{C}_d^r(L) \subset C_d^r(L).$$

We use the corresponding notations also for $r = \infty$.

Although we are mainly interested in results for $C_d^r(L)$, we will sometimes prove lower bounds on the information complexity for $\overline{C}_d^r(L)$ which imply the same lower bounds for $C_d^r(L)$.

2.3 Convex Hull

As already mentioned in the introduction, the lower bounds on multivariate integration presented in this paper are based on a volume estimate of a neighborhood of certain sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Generally, these sets are convex hulls (or their neighborhoods) of n points in the set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Since we need the $\sqrt{d}$-scaling of the distance throughout this article, we will omit it in the notation from now on. For instance, we denote by A_δ the $(\delta\sqrt{d})$-neighborhood of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, which is defined by

$$A_\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \operatorname{dist}(x, A) \le \delta\sqrt{d}\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\operatorname{dist}(x, A) = \inf_{a \in A} \|x - a\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean distance of x from A. We also denote by $B_\delta^d(x)$ the d-dimensional Euclidean ball with center $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and radius $\delta\sqrt{d}$, i.e.,

$$B_\delta^d(x) \; = \; \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|y - x\|_2 \le \delta\sqrt{d}\}.$$

We begin with a result that holds for arbitrary sets D_d as long as their *radius* is small enough. The radius of a set $D_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined by

$$\operatorname{rad}(D_d) \; = \; \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{y \in D_d} \|y - x\|_2.$$

We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. Let $D_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded with $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$ and let $R = \frac{\operatorname{rad}(D_d)}{\sqrt{d}}$. Let K be the convex hull of n points $x_1, \dots, x_n \in D_d$. Then

$$\lambda_d(K_\delta) \; < \; n \left((R + 2\delta) \sqrt{\frac{\pi \mathrm{e}}{2}} \right)^d.$$

This is exponentially small for $R < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi \mathrm{e}}} \approx 0.4839$ and $\delta < 1/\sqrt{2\pi\mathrm{e}} - \frac{1}{2}R$.

Some of our results will be based on this estimate and thus, for convenience, whenever we refer to *sets* (D_d) *with small radius* we simply mean that

$$\limsup_{d \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{rad}(D_d)}{\sqrt{d}} < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi \mathrm{e}}}. \tag{5}$$

Note that, unfortunately, this result does not cover the most natural case of the unit cube for which $R = 1/2$, but the Euclidean ball of volume 1 is covered. Because of the importance of the unit cube we will treat it separately after the proof of the theorem.

Proof. Observe that for bounded D_d the infimum in the definition of the radius $\mathrm{rad}(D_d)$ is actually a minimum. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a point where this minimum is attained. By the result of Elekes [4], the convex hull K is contained in the union of the n balls, say $C^{(i)}$, with center $\frac{z+x_i}{2}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and radius $(R/2)\sqrt{d}$. Recall that $\lambda_d(B_\delta^d) < \big(\delta\sqrt{2\pi \mathrm{e}}\big)^d$, see e.g. (6) in [7]. This implies that

$$K_\delta \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} C_\delta^{(i)}.$$

Thus, for any i we have

$$\lambda_d(K_\delta) \le n\,\lambda_d(C_\delta^{(i)}) < n\left((R/2+\delta)\sqrt{2\pi \mathrm{e}}\right)^d.$$

□

We now turn to the case of the unit cube. First, we state a lemma that bounds the volume of the intersection of the cube with a single ball. Additionally, we estimate a value of the involved constant that will be important later.

Lemma 2.2. Let $z = (1/2, \ldots, 1/2)$ be the midpoint of the cube and assume that

$$|x_i - z_i| = \eta \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, d.$$

Then, for every $\delta < \sqrt{\eta^2 + 1/12}$, there exists a constant $\gamma = \gamma(\delta, \eta) < 1$ such that

$$\lambda_d\big(B_\delta^d(x) \cap [0,1]^d\big) \le \gamma^d.$$

In particular, $\gamma(1/4 + 1/100, 1/4) < \frac{7}{8}$.

Proof. First note that, by symmetry, it is enough to consider $x_i = z_i + \eta$, $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Let $B = B_\delta^d(x)$. By considering an independent random variable $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ uniformly distributed in $[0,1]^d$, the volume of $B \cap [0,1]^d$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_d\Big(B \cap [0,1]^d\Big) &= \mathbb{P}\Big(\|X - x\|_2 \le \delta\sqrt{d}\Big) = \mathbb{P}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{d}(X_j - 1/2 - \eta)^2 \le \delta^2 d\Big) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\exp\Big\{\alpha\Big(\delta^2 d - \sum_{j=1}^{d}(X_j - 1/2 - \eta)^2\Big)\Big\} \ge 1\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a free parameter. Define the random variables

$$Y_j = \exp\Big\{\alpha\Big(\delta^2 - (X_j - 1/2 - \eta)^2\Big)\Big\},$$

such that

$$\lambda_d\Big(B \cap [0,1]^d\Big) \;=\; \mathbb{P}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{d} Y_j \;\geq\; 1\Big).$$

We now use Markov's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \geq 1) \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}(Y),$$

which holds for all non-negative random variables Y, and obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{d} Y_j \geq 1\Big) \leq \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{d} Y_j\Big) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{E}Y_j.$$

The last equality follows from the independence of the Y_j. It remains to prove

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_1) \leq \gamma(\delta,\eta) < 1$$

for a suitable choice of α. To this end, observe that

$$\delta^2 - (x - 1/2 - \eta)^2 = \delta^2 - (1/2+\eta)^2 + 2x(1/2+\eta) - x^2 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_1) \;=\; \int_0^1 \exp\Big\{\alpha\Big(\delta^2 - (1/2+\eta)^2 + 2x(1/2+\eta) - x^2\Big)\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x$$

is a differentiable convex function in α with value 1 at $\alpha = 0$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}(Y_1) < 1$ for small enough $\alpha > 0$ if and only if $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mathbb{E}(Y_1)\big|_{\alpha=0} < 0$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mathbb{E}(Y_1)\big|_{\alpha=0} \;&=\; \int_0^1 \Big(\delta^2 - (1/2+\eta)^2 + 2x(1/2+\eta) - x^2\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&=\; \delta^2 - (1/2+\eta)^2 + (1/2+\eta) - 1/3 \\
&=\; \delta^2 - \eta^2 - 1/12,
\end{aligned}$$

which is less than 0 if $\delta^2 < \eta^2 + 1/12$. This proves the statement of the lemma.

Note that we can choose

$$\gamma(\delta,\eta) \;=\; \inf_{\alpha>0} \int_0^1 \exp\Big\{\alpha\Big(\delta^2 - (1/2+\eta)^2 + 2x(1/2+\eta) - x^2\Big)\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The bound on $\gamma(1/4+1/100, 1/4)$ is estimated numerically by Geogebra, using $\alpha = 9/2$. $\square$

Using this lemma we prove the following volume estimate for a neighborhood of the convex hull of n points in the cube.

Theorem 2.3. Let K be the convex hull of n points $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in [0,1]^d$. Then, for every $\delta < \frac{1}{12}$, there exists a constant $\widetilde{\gamma} = \widetilde{\gamma}(\delta) < 1$ (depending only on δ) such that

$$\lambda_d\Big(K_\delta \cap [0,1]^d\Big) \ \le\ n(d+1)\, \widetilde{\gamma}^d.$$

In particular, $\widetilde{\gamma}(1/100) < \frac{7}{8}$.

Proof. We closely follow the proof of Theorem 3 in [8], which is based on the results from Elekes in [4] and Dyer, Füredi, McDiarmid in [6].

First, it follows from Carathéodory's theorem that $K \subset [0,1]^d$ is contained in the convex hull of at most $k = n(d+1)$ vertices of the unit cube $[0,1]^d$. So, to prove the claim of the theorem, it is enough to show that

$$\lambda_d\Big(\overline{K}_\delta \cap [0,1]^d\Big) \le k\, \widetilde{\gamma}(\delta)^d,$$

where $\overline{K} \subset [0,1]^d$ is the convex hull of k vertices of $[0,1]^d$. Note that $\overline{K}_\delta$ cannot be a subset of $[0,1]^d$ for $\delta > 0$.

By Elekes' result from [4], $\overline{K}$ is contained in the union of k balls with radius $\sqrt{d}/4$ and centers in the midpoints of the segments from the corresponding vertex to the midpoint of the unit cube, i.e. the coordinates of the midpoints of the balls, say $y_{i,j}$, satisfy $y_{i,j} \in \{1/4, 3/4\}$. This implies that $\overline{K}_\delta$ is contained in the union of the k balls with the same centers and radius $(1/4+\delta)\sqrt{d}$. That is,

$$\overline{K}_\delta \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} C_\delta(y_i),$$

where $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \ldots, y_{i,d})$ satisfies $y_{i,j} \in \{1/4, 3/4\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $j = 1, \ldots, d$, and $C_\delta(y_i) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|x - y_i\|_2 \le (1/4+\delta)\sqrt{d}\}$. Hence,

$$\lambda_d\Big(\overline{K}_\delta \cap [0,1]^d\Big) \ \le\ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_d\Big(C_\delta(y_i) \cap [0,1]^d\Big).$$

Since $|y_{i,j} - z_j| = 1/4$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $j = 1, \ldots, d$, where $z = (1/2, \ldots, 1/2)$, we can apply Lemma 2.2 to obtain the result with $\widetilde{\gamma}(\delta) = \gamma(1/4+\delta, 1/4)$. $\square$

2.4 Convolutions

In this section we recall a result from [7] which is the main ingredient for our proof of the curse of dimensionality for classes of smooth functions. Roughly speaking, given an initial function, this result shows that convolution with a (normalized) indicator function of a ball preserves certain "nice" properties of the initial function, while increasing the degree of its smoothness by one.

For convenience, throughout this section we study functions that are defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$. As an obvious corollary of Theorem 2.4 below we will obtain that the restrictions of the constructed functions to the unit cube satisfy the same bounds.

To be precise, fix a number $\delta > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^k$ with $\alpha_j > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \le 1.$$

For example, we may take $\alpha_j = 1/k$ for $j = 1, 2 \ldots, k$. Later we will let k tend to infinity. Then the sequence $\alpha_j = c_\eta \cdot j^{-1-\eta}$ with some $\eta > 0$ and $c_\eta = \frac{1}{\zeta(1+\eta)}$ will be our choice. Here, ζ denotes the Riemann zeta function.

For $j = 1, \ldots, k$, we define the ball

$$B_j \;=\; \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \;\middle|\; \|x\|_2 \;\le\; \alpha_j \, \delta \sqrt{d} \right\}$$

and the function $g_j \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_j(x) \;=\; \frac{\mathbb{1}_{B_j}(x)}{\lambda_d(B_j)} \;=\; \frac{1}{\lambda_d(B_j)} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in B_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Recall that the convolution of two functions f and g is defined by

$$(f * g)(x) \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-t)\, g(t) \, \mathrm{d}t, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Additionally recall from Section 2.2 that by the Lipschitz constant of f we mean

$$\mathrm{Lip}(f) = \sup_{x \ne y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|_2}.$$

Theorem 2.4. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in C^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define

$$f_k = f * g_1 * \ldots * g_k \quad \text{with} \;\; g_j \text{ from (6).}$$

For $d \geq 2$, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be Lebesgue measurable and let Ω_δ be its neighborhood defined as in (4). Then

(*i*) if $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega_\delta$ then $f_k(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$,

(*ii*) $\mathrm{Lip}(f_k) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(f)$,

(*iii*) if $\int_\Omega f(x+t)\,\mathrm{d}x \;\geq\; \varepsilon$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|t\|_2 \leq \delta\sqrt{d}$ then $\int_\Omega f_k(x)\mathrm{d}x \geq \varepsilon$,

(*iv*) for all $\ell \leq r$ and all $\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_r \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\mathrm{Lip}\Big(D^{\theta_\ell}\, D^{\theta_{\ell-1}} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f_k\Big) \leq \mathrm{Lip}\Big(D^{\theta_\ell}\, D^{\theta_{\ell-1}} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f\Big),$$

(*v*) $f_k \in C^{r+k}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and for all $\ell \leq r$, all $j = 1, \ldots, k$ and all $\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_{\ell+j} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\mathrm{Lip}\Big(D^{\theta_{\ell+j}}\, D^{\theta_{\ell+j-1}} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f_k\Big) \leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{1}{\delta\alpha_i}\right) \mathrm{Lip}\Big(D^{\theta_\ell}\, D^{\theta_{\ell-1}} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f\Big).$$

In particular,

(*vi*) $\mathrm{Lip}(f_k^{(\ell)}) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(\ell)})$ for all $\ell \leq r$,

(*vii*) $\mathrm{Lip}(f_k^{(\ell+j)}) \leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{1}{\delta\alpha_i}\right) \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(\ell)})$ for all $\ell \leq r$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$.

See [7] for the proof of (*i*) through (*v*). Properties (*vi*) and (*vii*) are consequences of (*iv*) and (*v*), respectively.

3 Lipschitz Functions

In this section we consider Lipschitz functions. The results of Sukharev [16] imply the curse of dimensionality for multivariate integration for the class

$$F_d = \{f \colon [0,1]^d \to \mathbb{R} \;\;|\;\; \mathrm{Lip}(f) \leq 1\}.$$

We prove the curse of dimensionality for smaller classes of Lipschitz functions. Roughly speaking, the curse holds iff the Lipschitz constant in dimension d is of the order $d^{-1/2}$ or larger.

In the notation of Subsection 2.2, we consider the classes

$$C_d^0(L) = \Big\{ f\colon D_d \to \mathbb{R} \ \Big| \ \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f) \le L_{0,d} =: L_d \Big\},$$

where $L = (L_d)$ and the sequences $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfy the following property.

We say that $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Property (**P**) if it is a sequence of open sets with $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$ such that there exist a sequence $(x_d^*)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$, $x_d^* \in D_d$ and $R < \infty$ with

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} \lambda_d\big(\{x \in D_d \mid \|x - x_d^*\|_2 \ge R\sqrt{d}\}\big) \ = \ 0. \tag{$\mathbf{P}$}$$

In particular, (**P**) holds for all sequences with $\mathrm{rad}(D_d)$ of order $\sqrt{d}$ or the sequences of ℓ_p^d-balls, $p > 0$, with volume 1. For a derivation of the last statement see [14].

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that the sequence $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (**P**). Then the curse of dimensionality holds for $C_d^0(L)$ if and only if

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_d\,\sqrt{d} > 0.$$

We prove lower and upper bounds separately in the next two subsections.

3.1 Lower Bounds

Here we prove the curse for the classes $\overline{C}_d^0(L)$ of functions that are restrictions to D_d of functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|f\| \le 1$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(f) \le L_d$. This implies also the curse for $C_d^0(L)$.

Proposition 3.2. The information complexity for the class $\overline{C}_d^0(L)$ satisfies

$$n(\varepsilon, \overline{C}_d^0(L)) \ge (1 - a\varepsilon) \left(\frac{a L_d \sqrt{d}}{3\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}} \right)^d \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1/a), d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a \ge 1.$$

This implies the curse of dimensionality for the class $\overline{C}_d^0(L)$ if

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_d\sqrt{d} > 0.$$

Proof. Since $\overline{C}^0_d(L)$ is convex and symmetric, we know that adaption does not help, see [2]. Hence, for given d and n, we may assume that the information on f is given by function values $f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots, f(x_n)$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in D_d$. Let $K = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and consider the function

$$\overline{f}(x) = \min\bigl\{1, L_d \operatorname{dist}(x, K)\bigr\} \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Since $\operatorname{dist}(\,\cdot\,, K)$ has Lipschitz constant 1, we have $f := \overline{f}\big|_{D_d} \in \overline{C}^0_d(L)$. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_\delta \,=\, \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} B^d_\delta(x_i),$$

where $B^d_\delta(x_i)$ is the ball with center x_i and radius $\delta\sqrt{d} = \frac{1}{L_d}$. Note that $f(x) = 1$ for all $x \notin \mathcal{P}_\delta$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_d} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \,\geq\, \int_{D_d \setminus \mathcal{P}_\delta} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \,&=\, 1 - \lambda_d(\mathcal{P}_\delta \cap D_d) \\ &\geq\, 1 - \lambda_d(\mathcal{P}_\delta) \,\geq\, 1 - n\lambda_d(B^d_\delta). \end{aligned}$$

It is shown in [7, eq. (6)] that

$$\lambda_d(B^d_\delta) < \frac{\left(3\delta\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}\right)^d}{\sqrt{\pi d}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{D_d} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \,>\, 1 - \frac{n\left(3\delta\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}\right)^d}{\sqrt{\pi d}} \,>\, 1 - n\left(\frac{3\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}}{L_d\sqrt{d}}\right)^d.$$

The bound on $n(\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(L))$ for $a = 1$ follows.

Now assume that $a > 1$. It follows from $\overline{C}^0_d(aL) \subset a\overline{C}^0_d(L)$ that

$$n\bigl(\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(L)\bigr) \,=\, n\bigl(a\varepsilon, a\overline{C}^0_d(L)\bigr) \,\geq\, n\bigl(a\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(aL)\bigr). \tag{7}$$

A simple substitution using the result above for $a = 1$ in the above inequality leads to

$$n(\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(L)) \geq n\bigl(a\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(aL)\bigr) \,\geq\, (1 - a\varepsilon)\left(\frac{aL_d\sqrt{d}}{3\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}}\right)^d.$$

This implies the curse for $\alpha := \limsup L_d\sqrt{d} > 0$. Indeed, for any $\eta \in (0, \alpha)$ it is enough to take $a > \frac{3\sqrt{2\mathrm{e}\pi}}{\alpha - \eta}$. Then the lower bound on $n(\varepsilon, \overline{C}^0_d(L))$ is exponentially large in d for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{a}$. □

Note that Proposition 3.2 leads to a super-exponential lower bound on the information complexity, if L_d decays slower than $d^{-1/2}$.

3.2 Upper Bounds

In the last subsection we proved the curse of dimensionality for function classes with (roughly speaking) Lipschitz constant bounded from below by a positive multiple of $1/\sqrt{d}$. In this subsection we complement this result by proving upper bounds which are simply based on one point formulas. That is, assuming (**P**), a single evaluation of the function is enough to obtain an arbitrary small error as long as d is large enough and $\lim_{d\to\infty} L_d\sqrt{d} = 0$. Recall that our function classes are defined by

$$C_d^0(L) = \bigl\{ f\colon D_d \to \mathbb{R} \;\bigm|\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f) \le L_d \bigr\}.$$

Proposition 3.3. Assume that the sequence $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (**P**). Let

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_d\sqrt{d} = 0.$$

Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^0(L)$ satisfies

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^0(L)) \;=\; 1$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $d \ge d(\varepsilon)$ large enough.

Proof. We use the one point formula

$$A_{1,d}(f) = f(x_d^*),$$

where we choose the x_d^* as provided by Property (**P**). With $R > 0$ from Property (**P**), we obtain for $f \in C_d^0(L)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_d(f) - A_{1,d}(f)| &= \left| \int_{D_d} (f(x) - f(x_d^*))\,\mathrm{d}x \right| \\
&\le \left| \int_{D_d\cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} (f(x) - f(x_d^*))\,\mathrm{d}x \right| + \left| \int_{D_d\setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)} (f(x) - f(x_d^*))\,\mathrm{d}x \right| \\
&\le L_d \int_{D_d\cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} \|x - x^*\|_2\,\mathrm{d}x + 2\,\lambda_d\bigl(D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)\bigr) \\
&\le RL_d\sqrt{d} + 2\,\lambda_d\bigl(D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)\bigr).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$e(A_{1,d}) \le RL_d\sqrt{d} + 2\,\lambda_d\bigl(D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)\bigr),$$

which tends to zero with d approaching infinity. This proves that $n(\varepsilon, C^0_d(L)) \le 1$. To finish the proof we need to show that $n(\varepsilon, C^0_d(L)) > 0$. Even for $L_d = 0$, the class $C^0_d(L)$ contains all constant functions $f(x) \equiv c$ for $c \in [-1, 1]$. If $n(\varepsilon, C^0_d(L)) = 0$ then we can use only constant algorithms $A_{0,d} \equiv \alpha$, where α is independent of f. Taking $f \equiv 1$ and $f \equiv -1$ we have

$$e(A_{0,d}) \ge \max(1 - \alpha|, |-1-\alpha|) \ge 1 > \varepsilon.$$

Hence, $n(\varepsilon, C^0_d(L))$ cannot be zero, and this completes the proof. $\square$

4 Functions with Lipschitz Gradients

In this section we want to strengthen the results from the previous section by proving the curse of dimension for a smaller class of functions. In fact, we impose bounds on the Lipschitz constants of the derivatives of the functions that are of order $1/d$ (instead of $1/\sqrt{d}$).

Now we can no longer assume arbitrary domains for the lower bounds. The essential geometric property of the sets D_d that we need is that a sufficiently large neighborhood of the convex hull of n points in D_d has very small volume as long as n is not exponentially large in d. We proved such estimates in Section 2.3 for sets with small radius and for the unit cube. Recall that

$$C^1_d(L) = \left\{ f \in C^1(D_d) \;\middle|\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f) \le L_{0,d},\ \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f) \le L_{1,d} \right\}.$$

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. Let D_d be the cube $(0,1)^d$, a ball of volume 1 or, more generally, a convex set of small radius in the sense of (5) with $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$. Then the curse of dimensionality holds for $C^1_d(L)$ if and only if

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d > 0.$$

Again, we prove lower and upper bounds separately in the next two subsections. Then Theorem 4.1 is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.2, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.8.

4.1 Lower Bounds

Assume that (D_d) is a sequence of convex sets of small radius or the unit cube. To prove the curse of dimensionality for the class $C^1_d(L)$, we proceed as in Section 3.1 and show the curse for the smaller class $\overline{C}^1_d(L)$. For this we construct, for given sample points $x_1, \dots, x_n \in D_d$, a fooling function that is defined on the entire $\mathbb{R}^d$ and fulfills the required bounds on the

Lipschitz constants. This function will be zero at the points $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and will have a large integral in D_d as long as n is not exponentially large in d. Moreover, this function will be zero in a neighborhood of the entire convex hull of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Unfortunately, we were not able to construct a fooling function that is zero only at $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ (as for Lipschitz functions). Such a function would probably be an important step towards an improvement of the results of this paper for the case of higher smoothness.

Let $\phi\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the squared distance function, which is defined as

$$\phi(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta)^2,$$

where K is the convex hull of the n points $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in D_d$ and K_δ is defined as in (4). The function ϕ obviously vanishes on K_δ. Let $P_{K_\delta} : \mathbb{R}^d \to K_\delta$ be the nearest neighbor projection, i.e., $P_{K_\delta}(x)$ is the unique point in K_δ given by

$$\|x - P_{K_\delta}(x)\|_2 = \operatorname{dist}\big(x, K_\delta\big).$$

It follows from Theorem 3.3 in [5] that ϕ is differentiable with gradient

$$\nabla\phi(x) \;=\; 2\big(x - P_{K_\delta}(x)\big).$$

Since P_{K_δ} is a contraction, this also implies

$$\|\nabla\phi(x) - \nabla\phi(y)\|_2 \le 4\|x - y\|_2 \qquad \text{for all} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

That is, $\nabla\phi$ is Lipschitz with constant $\operatorname{Lip}(\nabla\phi) \le 4$.

The fooling function will now be the restriction of a function of the form

$$f = p \circ \phi$$

with ϕ as above and with some bounded and smooth function $p\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$. Before we state our choice of p explicitly, we now show how (and which) properties of p imply the needed properties of f. First, if we assume that $p(0) = 0$, we obtain $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in K_\delta$. Moreover, we have

$$\|f\|_\infty \le \|p\|_\infty := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |p(t)|,$$

so bounds on function values of p directly translate into bounds on function values of f.

Assuming differentiability of p, we obtain the formula

$$\nabla f(x) \;=\; p'\big(\phi(x)\big)\nabla\phi(x) \;=\; 2p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta)^2\big)\big(x - P_{K_\delta}(x)\big). \tag{8}$$

This implies

$$\|\nabla f(x)\|_2 \;=\; 2p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta)^2\big)\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta).$$

So any uniform upper bound on the function $2\sqrt{t}\,p'(t)$ is also an upper bound for $\|\nabla f(x)\|_2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that

$$|D^\theta f(x)| \;=\; |\left\langle \theta, \nabla f(x)\right\rangle| \;\le\; \|\nabla f(x)\|_2 \qquad \text{for all } \theta \in S^{d-1}.$$

This gives an upper bound on all directional derivatives of f of order one, and thus a bound on the Lipschitz constant of f. Additionally, for all $\theta \in S^{d-1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Lip}(D^\theta f) \;&=\; \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|D^\theta f(x) - D^\theta f(y)|}{\|x-y\|_2} \;=\; \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\left\langle \theta, \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\right\rangle|}{\|x-y\|_2} \\ &\le\; \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_2}{\|x-y\|_2} \;=\; \operatorname{Lip}(\nabla f),\end{aligned}$$

which implies a bound on the Lipschitz constant of the (first-order) derivatives of f given a bound on $\operatorname{Lip}(\nabla f)$. But, if we assume $p(t) = 1$ for $t > \delta^2 d$, then $\nabla f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta) > \delta\sqrt{d}$, i.e., for all $x \notin K_{2\delta}$. This gives

$$\operatorname{Lip}(\nabla f) \;=\; \operatorname{Lip}(\nabla f|_{K_{2\delta}}).$$

Using (8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{2}\big(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\big) \;&=\; p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta)^2\big)\big(x - P_{K_\delta}(x)\big) - p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(y,K_\delta)^2\big)\big(y - P_{K_\delta}(y)\big) \\ &=\; p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(y,K_\delta)^2\big)\Big(x - P_{K_\delta}(x) - y + P_{K_\delta}(y)\Big) \\ &\qquad + \Big(p'\big(\operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta)^2\big) - p'(\operatorname{dist}(y,K_\delta)^2)\Big)\big(x - P_{K_\delta}(x)\big).\end{aligned}$$

The norm of the first term can be bounded by $2\|p'\|_\infty\,\|x-y\|_2$, whereas, for $x, y \in K_{2\delta}$, the second term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{Lip}(p')\left|\operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta)^2 - \operatorname{dist}(y,K_\delta)^2\right| \operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta) \\ &\qquad\qquad \le\; \operatorname{Lip}(p')\,\|x-y\|_2\;(\operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta) + \operatorname{dist}(y,K_\delta))\;\operatorname{dist}(x,K_\delta) \\ &\qquad\qquad \le\; 2\delta^2 d\operatorname{Lip}(p')\,\|x-y\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used $\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta) \le \delta\sqrt{d}$ for $x \in K_{2\delta}$. This yields that

$$\operatorname{Lip}(D^\theta f) \;\le\; \operatorname{Lip}(\nabla f) \;\le\; 4\left(\|p'\|_\infty + \delta^2 d\operatorname{Lip}(p')\right).$$

In summary, we want to construct a differentiable function $p\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

(a) $\quad p(0) \,=\, 0,$

(b) $\quad \|p\|_\infty = 1,$

(c) $\quad p(t) = 1 \;$ for $t > \delta^2 d,$

(d) $\quad 2\sqrt{t}p'(t) \le \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and

(e) $\quad 4\left(\|p'\|_\infty + \delta^2 d\,\mathrm{Lip}(p')\right) \,\le\, \frac{40}{\delta^2 d}.$

These properties, once verified, imply that $f|_{D_d} \in \overline{C}_d^1(L)$ with $f = p \circ \phi$, where

$$L_{0,d} = \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{1,d} = \frac{40}{\delta^2 d}.$$

We now give an explicit construction of such a function p. We use the function

$$p(t) \;=\; \begin{cases} \frac{2t}{\delta^2 d}, & \text{if} \quad t \le \frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \\ -\frac{2t}{\delta^2 d} + \frac{4\sqrt{t}}{\delta\sqrt{d}} - 1, & \text{if} \quad t \in \left(\frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \delta^2 d\right), \\ 1, & \text{if} \quad t \ge \delta^2 d. \end{cases}$$

We obtain immediately the properties (a)–(c) for p. Furthermore, p is continuously differentiable with derivative

$$p'(t) \;=\; \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\delta^2 d}, & \text{if} \quad t \le \frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \\ -\frac{2}{\delta^2 d} + \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}, & \text{if} \quad t \in \left(\frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \delta^2 d\right), \\ 0, & \text{if} \quad t \ge \delta^2 d. \end{cases}$$

Using this, we obtain property (d). For (e) observe that p' is absolutely continuous and thus, almost everywhere differentiable with derivative

$$p''(t) \;=\; \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\delta\sqrt{d}}\frac{1}{t^{3/2}}, & \text{if} \quad t \in \left(\frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \delta^2 d\right), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

for all $t \notin \left\{\frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \delta^2 d\right\}$. It is well known that in such cases the Lipschitz constant of p' is equal to the supremum of $|p''(t)|$ over $t \notin \left\{\frac{\delta^2 d}{4}, \delta^2 d\right\}$. This proves that $\mathrm{Lip}(p') \le 8/(\delta^4 d^2)$ and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 4\left(\|p'\|_\infty + \delta^2 d\,\mathrm{Lip}(p')\right) \;&\le\; 4\left(\frac{2}{\delta^2 d} + \delta^2 d\left(\frac{1}{\delta\sqrt{d}}\,\frac{1}{(\delta\sqrt{d}/2)^3}\right)\right) \\ &\le\; 4\left(\frac{2}{\delta^2 d} + \frac{8\delta^2 d}{\delta^4 d^2}\right) \;=\; \frac{40}{\delta^2 d}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the last property (e).

The following result shows the curse for a specific choice of the bounds $L^* = (L^*_{0,d}, L^*_{1,d})_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ and thus, for every L that is a constant multiple of L^*. If we consider the domains to be unit cubes, we obtain

Proposition 4.2. Let $D_d = (0,1)^d$. For

$$L^*_{0,d} = \frac{400}{\sqrt{d}} \quad \text{and} \quad L^*_{1,d} = \frac{16\cdot 10^5}{d}$$

we have

$$n\big(\varepsilon, \overline{C}^1_d(L^*)\big) \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{d+1}\left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^d \qquad \text{for all } d\in\mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varepsilon\in(0,1).$$

Hence, the curse of dimensionality holds also for the class $\overline{C}^1_d(L)$ if

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d > 0.$$

Proof. Let $\delta = 1/200$. As discussed above, the restriction $\widetilde{f} = f|_{D_d}$ satisfies $\widetilde{f} \in \overline{C}^1_d(L^*)$. It remains to bound its integral in D_d. By property (c) of p we have $\widetilde{f}(x) = 1$ for all x with $\operatorname{dist}(x, K_\delta)^2 > \delta^2 d$, i.e. for all $x \notin K_{2\delta}$. Then Theorem 2.3 implies

$$\int_{(0,1)^d} \widetilde{f}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq \int_{(0,1)^d\setminus K_{2\delta}} \widetilde{f}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1 - \lambda_d(K_{2\delta}\cap[0,1]^d) > 1 - n(d+1)\left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^d.$$

This proves the curse for $\overline{C}^1_d(L^*)$ if $\limsup L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 400$ and $\limsup L_{1,d}\, d > 2^{21}$. Similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 (using $\overline{C}^1_d(aL) \subset a\overline{C}^1_d(L)$ for $a \geq 1$) conclude the proof in the general case. $\square$

We now consider the class of domains with small radius. The proof follows exactly the same lines but with the use of Theorem 2.3 replaced by Theorem 2.1. Furthermore, in contrast to Theorem 4.1, we do not have to assume now convexity of the domains D_d.

Proposition 4.3. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of sets with small radius in the sense of (5). Then the curse of dimensionality holds for the class $\overline{C}^1_d(L)$, if

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d > 0.$$

Proof. We present only a sketch of the proof, since it is almost identical to the proof of Proposition 4.2. First, note that for every set of small radius there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\lambda_d(K_{2\delta})$ is exponentially small in d, where K is the convex hull of n points in D_d, see Theorem 2.1. Choosing this δ in the above construction of the fooling function f (and its restriction $\widetilde{f}$) shows the curse for the classes $C^1_d(L)$ with $\limsup L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > C$ and $\limsup L_{1,d}\, d > C$ for some $C < \infty$. Again, we obtain the result by scaling. $\square$

Remark 4.4. Note that the calculations of this section could be done also with the function $\mathrm{dist}(x, K)^2$ which vanishes only on K instead of K_δ. This would have somewhat reduced the constants in Proposition 4.2. For convenience we worked with ϕ as above, since we need this function also in Section 5.

Remark 4.5. With similar ideas as used in [7], it is not possible to produce super-exponential lower bounds on the information complexity in the cases of Proposition 4.2 and 4.3. The reason is that even with very small δ (depending on d) the volume of the $\delta\sqrt{d}$-neighborhood of the convex hull cannot be super-exponentially small. However, we conjecture that the information complexity is super-exponential for slightly larger classes, e.g., if the conditions

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d > 0$$

are replaced by

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} = \infty \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d = \infty.$$

Remark 4.6. Note that instead of this rather complicated function p it would be possible to work with the function $\widetilde{p}(t) = t/(\delta^2 d)$ to obtain essentially the same result. But in this case one would have to do the analysis directly for the functions restricted to the subsets $D_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and, in addition, one would obtain the desired lower bound on the information complexity only for sufficiently small ε and not for all $\varepsilon < 1$ as above.

4.2 Upper Bounds

In the last subsection we proved the curse of dimensionality for function classes with (roughly speaking) Lipschitz constant of the gradient bounded from below by a positive multiple of $1/d$. In this subsection we complement this result by proving matching upper bounds. Again using a one point formula is enough to ensure an arbitrary small error as long as d is large enough and $\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d = 0$.

We present two versions of this result. One that holds for convex sets with Property (**P**) and one that holds for arbitrary convex domains.

Again, we want to deal with a function class as large as possible. Therefore, we drop the bounds $\|f\|_\infty \le 1$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(f) \le L_{0,d}$ and consider

$$F_d^1 = \big\{ f \colon D_d \to \mathbb{R} \ \mid \ \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f) \le L_{1,d} \big\} \supset C_d^1(L).$$

Proposition 4.7. Let D_d be convex. Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^1(L)$ and F_d^1 satisfy

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^1(L)) = n(\varepsilon, F_d^1) = 1$$

provided that $L_{1,d}\,\mathrm{diam}(D_d)^2 \le \varepsilon$, where $\mathrm{diam}(D_d)$ is the diameter of the set D_d. Hence, if

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\,\mathrm{diam}(D_d)^2 = 0,$$

then

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^1(L)) = n(\varepsilon, F_d^1) \ = \ 1$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ if $d \ge d(\varepsilon)$ is large enough.

Proof. We use the one point formula $A_{1,d}(f) = f(z)$ where $z \in D_d$ is the centroid (center of gravity) of D_d. Then we have

$$S_d(f) - A_{1,d}(f) = \int_{D_d} \big(f(x) - f(z) \big)\, \mathrm{d}x = \int_{D_d} r(x)\, \mathrm{d}x$$

with

$$r(x) = f(x) - f(z) - \nabla f(z) \cdot (x - z)$$

since the integral over D_d of the function $a \cdot (x - z)$ vanishes for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We estimate $r(x)$ by using the mean value theorem, which implies the existence of a point y on the segment $[x, z]$ such that

$$f(x) - f(z) = \nabla f(y) \cdot (x - z).$$

¿From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we conclude that for $f \in F_d^1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |r(x)| \ &= \ \big|\big(\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(z)\big) \cdot (x - z)\big| \le \|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(z)\,\|_2 \|x - z\|_2 \\ &\le \ L_{1,d}\,\|y - z\|_2\,\|x - z\|_2 \le L_{1,d}\,\|x - z\|_2^2 \le L_{1,d}\,\mathrm{diam}(D_d)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the error of $A_{1,d}$ on F_d^1 is bounded by $L_{1,d}\,\mathrm{diam}(D_d)^2$ and tends to zero for $d \to \infty$. Therefore, the curse of dimensionality is not present since $n(\varepsilon, F_d^1) \le 1$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and large enough d. Repeating the argument used in the proof of Proposition 3.3 we conclude that $n(\varepsilon, F_d^1) = 1$, as claimed. $\square$

Note that Proposition 4.7 is already enough to prove the respective part of Theorem 4.1. However, the next proposition shows that, if the sequence $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (**P**), then the curse does not hold if $L_{1,d}\, d$ tends to zero. Note that, if the D_d's are ℓ_1^d-balls (which satisfy (**P**)), Proposition 4.7 would require that $L_{1,d}\, d^2 \to 0$ instead of $L_{1,d}\, d \to 0$.

Unfortunately, we can not omit the bound on the supremum of f as above. Therefore, we consider the classes

$$F_d^2 = \bigl\{ f\colon D_d \to \mathbb{R} \;\mid\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f) \le L_{1,d} \bigr\} \supset C_d^1(L).$$

Proposition 4.8. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets that satisfies (**P**). Additionally assume

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{1,d}\, d = 0.$$

Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^1(L)$ and F_d^2 satisfy

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^1(L)) = n(\varepsilon, F_d^2) \;=\; 1$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ if $d \ge d(\varepsilon)$ is large enough.

Proof. We use the same techniques as in the proofs of Propositions 3.3 and 4.7. Now, the algorithm is the one point formula $A_{1,d}(f) = f(z)$ where $z \in D_d$ is the centroid of $D_d \cap B_R^d(x_d^*)$, where R and x_d^* are from (**P**). Set $B = B_R^d(x_d^*)$. Then we have

$$S_d(f) - A_{1,d}(f) = \int_{D_d} \bigl(f(x) - f(z)\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{D_d \cap B} \widetilde{r}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{D_d \setminus B} \bigl(f(x) - f(z)\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

with

$$\widetilde{r}(x) = f(x) - f(z) - \nabla f(z) \cdot (x - z)$$

since the integral over $D_d \cap B$ of the function $a \cdot (x - z)$ vanishes for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We estimate $\widetilde{r}(x)$ in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 4.7 (using $\mathrm{diam}(D_d \cap B) \le R\sqrt{d}$) and the second term as in Proposition 3.3 (using $\|f\|_\infty \le 1$). We obtain

$$|S_d(f) - A_{1,d}(f)| \le R^2 L_{1,d}\, d + 2\,\lambda_d\bigl(D_d \setminus B\bigr)$$

for all $f \in F_d^2$, which, under the assumptions of the proposition, tends to zero for $d \to \infty$. The rest is as before. $\square$

5 Functions with Higher Smoothness

In this section we deal with the general classes

$$C_d^k(L) = \{f \in C^k(D_d) \;\Big|\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}) \le L_{j,d} \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, k\}.$$

For $k > 1$, our lower and upper bounds will not match anymore even if $D_d = (0,1)^d$. The upper bound is proved using Taylor's formula which leads to an additional factor $1/\sqrt{d}$ for each additional derivative. In the proof of the lower bound we will use the smoothing by convolution which does not give any additional gain in the bounds for the higher derivatives. We are stuck with $1/d$ starting from $r = 1$.

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 5.1. Let D_d be the cube $(0,1)^d$ or a set of small radius in the sense of (5). For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the conditions

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d > 0 \;\text{ for }\; j = 1, \dots, k$$

imply the curse of dimensionality for $C_d^k(L)$.

On the other hand, if D_d is convex and there exists $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} = 0$$

then the curse does not hold.

5.1 Lower Bounds

The lower bounds on the information complexity in this case are mainly based on Theorem 2.4, which shows that convolution with certain indicator functions, see (6), increases the smoothness of the initial function by loosing only a factor in the bounds on the Lipschitz constants of the higher order derivatives.

For this, recall from Section 2.4 that we have fixed a number $\delta > 0$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^{\ell}$ with $\alpha_j > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_j \le 1.$$

For the purpose of this section we choose $\alpha_j = 1/\ell$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Additionally, recall that g_j is the normalized indicator function of a ball with radius $\alpha_j \delta \sqrt{d}$ and that we define

$$f_\ell = f * g_1 * \cdots * g_\ell.$$

Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in D_d$ be the sampling points and K their convex hull. The initial function for the convolution will be the function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ that was constructed in Section 4.1. This function satisfies the following properties:

- $f \in C^1$,
- $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in K_\delta$,
- $f(x) = 1$ for $x \notin K_{2\delta}$,
- $\mathrm{Lip}(f) \leq \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}}$ and
- $\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(1)}) \leq \frac{40}{\delta^2 d}$.

By Theorem 2.4 we immediately obtain

- $f_\ell \in C^{\ell+1}$,
- $f_\ell(x) = 0$ for $x \in K$,
- $f_\ell(x) = 1$ for $x \notin K_{3\delta}$,
- $\mathrm{Lip}(f_\ell) \leq \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}}$ and
- $L^*_{j,d} := \mathrm{Lip}(f_\ell^{(j)}) \leq \frac{40}{\delta^2 d} \left(\frac{\ell}{\delta}\right)^{j-1}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, \ell + 1$.

Thus, setting $\ell = k - 1$, we have $f_\ell|_{D_d} \in \overline{C}^k_d(L^*) \subset C^k_d(L^*)$, where

$$L^*_{0,d} = \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}} \quad \text{and} \quad L^*_{j,d} = \frac{40}{\delta^2 d}\left(\frac{k-1}{\delta}\right)^{j-1} \quad \text{for } \; j = 1, \dots, k. \tag{9}$$

By the third property of f_ℓ we additionally obtain

$$\int_{D_d} f_\ell(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \;\geq\; \int_{D_d \setminus K_{3\delta}} f_\ell(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; 1 - \lambda_d(K_{3\delta} \cap D_d).$$

Using the upper bounds for the volume on the right hand side from Section 2.3, which were already used in the proofs of Proposition 4.2 and 4.3, we obtain the desired lower bounds on the information complexity. In particular, we obtain for small enough positive δ (depending only on the sequence $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$), that there exists $\eta = \eta(\delta) > 1$ such that

$$n(\varepsilon, C^k_d(L^*)) \;\geq\; (1-\varepsilon)\,\eta^d \tag{10}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and infinitely many $d \in \mathbb{N}$, where the sequence L^* is given by (9).

Using the same scaling technique that was used in Sections 3.1 and 4.1 we obtain the curse of dimensionality under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1.

Remark 5.2. If D_d is the cube we could also give an explicit lower bound on the information complexity for the class $C_d^k(L^*)$ with $L^* = (L^*_{j,d})$ from above. In fact, the same lower bound as in Proposition 4.2 holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if we set $\delta = 1/300$.

5.2 Upper Bounds

We now prove that the curse of dimensionality does not hold if the condition

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} = 0$$

holds for some $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$. We first observe that the cases $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ were already dealt with in the previous sections. For $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}$, we use the next proposition. Note that we prove the result under the assumption that the sets satisfy Property (**P**). Both, the cube and sets of small radius, satisfy this assumption.

Proposition 5.3. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets that satisfies (**P**). Additionally assume that there exists $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}$ such that

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} = 0.$$

Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^k(L)$ satisfies

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(L)) \le \mathrm{e}^j\, d^j$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ if $d \ge d(\varepsilon)$ is large enough.

Proof. Let the sequence $(x_d^*)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $R < \infty$ be provided by Property (**P**). Assume first that $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k-1\}$. Then we take a Taylor polynomial of order j at the point $x_d^* \in D_d$ which can be written as

$$T_j(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{j} \frac{f^{(\ell)}(x_d^*)(x - x_d^*)^\ell}{\ell!} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad x \in D_d.$$

Here we use the standard notation $A(x^\ell) = A(x, \ldots, x)$ for the evaluation of an ℓ-linear map on the diagonal. Recall that we consider here $f^{(\ell)}(x_d^*)$ as an ℓ-linear map. It is well-known that the error of the approximation of f by T_j can be written as

$$f(x) - T_j(x) = (j+1) \int_0^1 (1-t)^j \, \frac{f^{(j+1)}\big(x_d^* + t(x - x_d^*)\big)(x - x_d^*)^{j+1}}{(j+1)!} \mathrm{d}t.$$

For $x \in D_d$ with $\|x - x_d^*\|_2 \le R\sqrt{d}$ we can now estimate the error as

$$|f(x) - T_j(x)| \le \frac{1}{j!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^j \, \mathrm{d}t \, \left\| f^{(j+1)} \right\| \, \|x - x_d^*\|_2^{j+1} \le \frac{R^{j+1}}{(j+1)!} \, L_{j,d} \, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}}.$$

If $j = k$, we use the same approximation and note that

$$f(x) - T_k(x) = f(x) - T_{k-1}(x) - \frac{f^{(k)}(x_d^*)(x - x_d^*)^k}{k!} = k \int_0^1 (1-t)^{k-1} \, r_x(t) \, \mathrm{d}t$$

with

$$r_x(t) = \frac{f^{(k)}\big(x_d^* + t(x - x_d^*)\big)(x - x_d^*)^k - f^{(k)}\big(x_d^*\big)(x - x_d^*)^k}{k!}.$$

Then for $x \in D_d$ with $\|x - x_d^*\|_2 \le R\sqrt{d}$, we get

$$|r_x(t)| \le \frac{\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(k)}) \, t \, \|x - x_d^*\|_2^{k+1}}{k!} \le \frac{R^{k+1}}{k!} \, L_{k,d} \, d^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \quad \text{for} \;\; t \in [0,1],$$

and

$$|f(x) - T_k(x)| \le \frac{R^{k+1}}{k!} \, L_{k,d} \, d^{\frac{k+1}{2}}.$$

So we have for all $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}$ we have

$$|f(x) - T_j(x)| \le \frac{R^{j+1}}{j!} \, L_{j,d} \, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}}$$

if $\|x - x_d^*\|_2 \le R\sqrt{d}$. For all such j, consider the algorithm

$$Q_{j,d}(f) = \int_{D_d \cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} T_j(x) \, \mathrm{d}x = \sum_{\beta\colon |\beta| \le j} \frac{D^\beta f(x_d^*)}{\beta!} \int_{D_d \cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} \prod_{j=1}^{d} \big(x_j - x_{d,j}^*\big)^{\beta_j} \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Since $\|f\|_\infty \le 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{D_d} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \; - \; Q_{j,d}(f) \right| &\le \left| \int_{D_d \cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} (f(x) - T_j(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x \right| + \left| \int_{D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right| \\ &\le \int_{D_d \cap B_R^d(x_d^*)} |f(x) - T_j(x)| \, \mathrm{d}x \, + \, \lambda_d\big(D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)\big) \\ &\le \frac{R^{j+1}}{j!} \, L_{j,d} \, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} \, + \, \lambda_d\big(D_d \setminus B_R^d(x_d^*)\big). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumptions of the proposition, both terms tend to zero as d goes to infinity. Thus, $Q_{j,d}$ yields an arbitrary small error if the dimension is large enough.

It remains to bound the cost of $Q_{j,d}$. First note that $Q_{j,d}$ is not an admissible algorithm since we can compute only function values. However, it is easy to see that we can approximate each partial derivative $D^\beta f(x^*)$ by divided differences with an arbitrary precision by computing only a number of function values that does not depend on the dimension d (but on $|\beta| \le j \le k$). More precisely, we can compute $Q_{j,d}(f)$ for $f \in C_d^k(L)$, $j \le k$, up to an arbitrary error $\eta > 0$ using

$$\binom{d+j}{j} \le \left(\frac{\mathrm{e}(d+j)}{j}\right)^j \le \mathrm{e}^j d^j$$

(for $d, j \ge 2$) function values of f, see [18]. The proposition follows. $\square$

5.3 Partial Derivatives

In this section we comment on results that can be deduced directly from the already proven statements. In particular, we state results for classes $\widetilde{C}_d^k(L)$ that are defined like $C_d^k(L)$ from (3), but with conditions on arbitrary directional derivatives replaced by conditions only on *partial* derivatives. The results follow solely by inclusion.

We define the function classes by

$$\widetilde{C}_d^k(L) = \left\{ f \in C^k(D_d) \;\middle|\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \sup_{|\beta|=j} \mathrm{Lip}(D^\beta f) \le L_{j,d} \text{ for all } j \le k \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that for each $f \in C^k(D_d)$ and $j \le k$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|\beta|=j} \mathrm{Lip}(D^\beta f) &\le \sup_{\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_j \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathrm{Lip}(D^{\theta_j} \ldots D^{\theta_1} f) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathrm{Lip}(D^\theta \ldots D^\theta f) \\ &= \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $x, y \in D_d$. Noting that

$$f^{(j)}(x)(\theta, \ldots, \theta) = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_j = 1}^{d} \frac{\partial^j f}{\partial x_{i_1}\, \partial x_{i_2} \cdots \partial x_{i_j}}(x)\, \theta_{i_1}\, \theta_{i_2} \cdots \theta_{i_j}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|f^{(j)}(x)(\theta,\dots,\theta) - f^{(j)}(y)(\theta,\dots,\theta)\right| &\le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} |\theta_i|\right)^j \sup_{|\beta|=j} \left|D^\beta f(x) - D^\beta f(y)\right| \\ &\le d^{j/2} \sup_{|\beta|=j} \left|D^\beta f(x) - D^\beta f(y)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}) \le d^{j/2} \sup_{|\beta|=j} \mathrm{Lip}(D^\beta f)$ and thus

$$C_d^k(L) \subset \widetilde{C}_d^k(L) \subset C_d^k\big((d^{j/2} L_{j,d})_{j,d\in\mathbb{N}}\big)$$

for arbitrary double sequences $L = (L_{j,d})_{j,d\in\mathbb{N}}$. An immediate consequence is that all previously proven lower bounds on the information complexity for $C_d^k(L)$ also hold unchanged for $\widetilde{C}_d^k(L)$. Moreover, we obtain from Theorem 5.1 the following proposition.

Proposition 5.4. Let D_d be the cube $(0,1)^d$ or a convex set of small radius in the sense of (5). Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the conditions

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d > 0 \;\text{ for }\; j = 1,\dots,k$$

imply the curse of dimensionality for $\widetilde{C}_d^k(L)$. If there exists $j \in \{0,1,\dots,k\}$ with

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{j+\frac{1}{2}} = 0$$

then the curse does not hold.

6 Functions with Infinite Smoothness

In this section we deal with C^∞ functions. The classes we consider are now of the form

$$C_d^\infty(L) = \{f \in C^\infty(D_d) \;\big|\; \|f\|_\infty \le 1,\ \mathrm{Lip}(f^{(j)}) \le L_{j,d} \text{ for } j = 0,1,2\dots\}.$$

The main result of this section is

Theorem 6.1. Let D_d be the cube $(0,1)^d$ or a set of small radius in the sense of (5). Then the conditions

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{0,d}\sqrt{d} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d > c\,(j!)^{1+\eta} \;\text{ for }\; j \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $c, \eta > 0$, imply the curse of dimensionality for $C_d^\infty(L)$.

On the other hand, if D_d is convex and there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} = 0$$

then the curse does not hold. Furthermore, if there exist constants $c < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$L_{j,d} \,\leq\, c\,(2+\delta)^j\, j!\; d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}}$$

for all $j, d \in \mathbb{N}$, then the problem of numerical integration for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ is quasi-polynomially tractable, i.e.,

$$\ln\bigl(n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L))\bigr) \,\leq\, C(1-\ln\varepsilon)(1+\ln d)$$

for some absolute $C < \infty$.

6.1 Lower Bounds

To prove lower bounds for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ we basically use the same fooling functions (f_k) as in Section 5.1, but with a different sequence (α_j). Moreover, we need to take the limit for $k \to \infty$. For this reason, we first study the convolution of infinitely many indicator functions g_j. The resulting function in the one-dimensional case is reminiscent of the up-function of Rvachev, see [13].

Recall the definition (6) of the L_1-normalized indicator functions g_j of the ball of radius $\alpha_j\delta\sqrt{d}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we define

$$G_k = g_1 * \ldots g_k.$$

Observe that G_2 is Lipschitz and $G_3 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Theorem 2.4 implies that G_k is also Lipschitz for $k \geq 2$ with $\mathrm{Lip}(G_k) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(G_2)$ and, more generally, $G_k \in C^\ell(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $k > \ell + 1 \geq 1$ with

$$\mathrm{Lip}(G_k^{(\ell)}) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(G_{\ell+2}^{(\ell)}).$$

This implies that the limit function

$$G_\infty = \lim_{k\to\infty} G_k$$

exists, the convergence is uniform, $G_\infty \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$G_\infty^{(\ell)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} G_k^{(\ell)}$$

uniformly for all $\ell \geq 0$. Indeed, fix a direction $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and let L_ℓ be the operator of ℓ-times differentiation in direction θ. Then

$$L_\ell G_n = L_\ell(G_{\ell+3}) * g_{\ell+4} \cdots * g_n$$

for $n \geq \ell + 3$ and the L_1-normalization of g_{n+1} imply

$$\begin{aligned} |L_\ell G_{n+1}(x) - L_\ell G_n(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(L_\ell G_n(x-y) - L_\ell G_n(x) \big) * g_{n+1}(y) \mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &\leq \int_{B_{n+1}} \big| L_\ell G_n(x-y) - L_\ell G_n(x) \big| * g_{n+1}(y) \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \operatorname{Lip}(L_\ell G_n) \alpha_{n+1} \delta \sqrt{d} \leq \operatorname{Lip}(G^{(\ell)}_{\ell+2}) \delta \sqrt{d}\, \alpha_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$|L_\ell G_{n+m}(x) - L_\ell G_n(x)| \leq \operatorname{Lip}(G^{(\ell)}_{\ell+2}) \delta \sqrt{d} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \alpha_k$$

for all $m \geq 1$. Now the summability of the sequence (α_j) shows that $\big(L_\ell G_n\big)$ is a uniform Cauchy sequence proving the claim.

Now we can define our final fooling function

$$f_\infty = f * G_\infty$$

using again the initial function f constructed in Section 4.1. Then the functions

$$f_k = f * G_k$$

converge uniformly to f_∞. We also have uniform convergence of the corresponding derivatives. By induction, we obtain the following properties from Theorem 2.4:

- $f_\infty \in C^\infty$,
- $f_\infty(x) = 0$ for $x \in K$,
- $f_\infty(x) = 1$ for $x \notin K_{3\delta}$,
- $\operatorname{Lip}(f_\infty) \leq \frac{2}{\delta\sqrt{d}}$ and
- $L^*_{j,d} := \operatorname{Lip}(f^{(j)}_\infty) \leq \frac{40}{\delta^2 d} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{\delta \alpha_i} \right)$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell + 1$.

Using the sequence $\alpha_j = c_\eta j^{-1-\eta}$ for $\eta > 0$ with $c_\eta = \zeta(1+\eta)^{-1}$ the last estimate yields

- $L^*_{j,d} := \mathrm{Lip}(f_\infty^{(j)}) \le \frac{40}{d}\delta^{-1-j}c_\eta^{1-j}\big((j-1)!\big)^{1+\eta}$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell+1$.

By the third property of f_ℓ we additionally obtain

$$\int_{D_d} f_\infty(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \;\ge\; \int_{D_d\setminus K_{3\delta}} f_\ell(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; 1 - \lambda_d(K_{3\delta}\cap D_d).$$

The proof of the lower bound in Theorem 6.1 is then finished exactly as in the case of finite smoothness k in Subsection 5.1. Note that in this case, we cannot use the argument of scaling for the class $C_d^\infty(L)$. Thus, the $(j!)^{1+\eta}$ remains in the asymptotic lower bound for $(L_{j,d})$.

6.2 Upper Bounds

We prove upper bounds on the information complexity for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ of infinitely differentiable functions. First of all, note that Proposition 5.3 holds unchanged for $k = \infty$. This is summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets that satisfies (**P**). Additionally assume that there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} = 0.$$

Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ satisfies

$$n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L)) \;\le\; \mathrm{e}^j\, d^j$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ if $d \ge d(\varepsilon)$ is large enough.

Again, this result only shows that, under the given assumptions, the curse of dimensionality does not hold for $C_d^\infty(L)$. The next proposition improves this result in the sense that we obtain *quasi-polynomial tractability*, that is

$$\ln\big(n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L))\big) \;\le\; C(1-\ln\varepsilon)(1+\ln d) \quad \text{for all } \; \varepsilon\in(0,1),\; d\in\mathbb{N},$$

for some absolute $C < \infty$, if the asymptotic conditions in the last proposition are replaced by uniform bounds. We prove two different variants of this result which differ by the power of the $j!$ in the required bounds.

Proposition 6.3. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets and define $R_d = \mathrm{rad}(D_d)/\sqrt{d}$. Additionally assume that there exist $a > 1$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$L_{j,d} \;\le\; c\, a^{-j}\, j!\, R_d^{-j-1}\, d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}}$$

for all $j, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the problem of numerical integration for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ is quasi-polynomially tractable.

This proves the respective part of Theorem 6.1 since the cube and convex sets of small radius satisfy $R_d \le 1/2$.

For $D_d = (0,1)^d$ a similar result is contained in [18]. The paper [18] also studies other classes of C^∞ functions defined on the ball and upper bounds are obtained using Taylor approximations.

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.3. Recall the definitions from there. In particular, we obtain in the same fashion for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in D_d$ that

$$|f(x) - T_j(x)| \;\le\; \frac{R_d^{j+1}}{j!}\, L_{j,d}\, d^{\frac{j+1}{2}} \;\le\; c\, a^{-j}$$

which is smaller than $\varepsilon > 0$ if $j \ge k_\varepsilon := \lceil \log_a(\frac{c}{\varepsilon}) \rceil$. Thus,

$$\left| \int_{D_d} f(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \;-\; Q_{k_\varepsilon,d}(f) \right| \;\le\; \varepsilon.$$

Again, it remains to bound the cost of $Q_{k_\varepsilon,d}$. Exactly as in the proof of Proposition 5.3, see also [18], we can compute $Q_{k_\varepsilon,d}(f)$ for $f \in C_d^\infty(L)$, up to an arbitrary error $\eta > 0$ using

$$\binom{d+k_\varepsilon}{k_\varepsilon} \le \left(\frac{\mathrm{e}(d+k_\varepsilon)}{k_\varepsilon} \right)^{k_\varepsilon} \le \mathrm{e}^{k_\varepsilon} d^{k_\varepsilon}$$

function values. We conclude

$$\ln\bigl(n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L))\bigr) \;\le\; k_\varepsilon(1+\ln d) \;\le\; (1+\ln c)(1+1/\ln a)(1-\ln\varepsilon)(1+\ln d).$$

The proposition follows. □

The last proposition of this section deals with the case where the (uniform) upper bounds on $(L_{j,d})$ have a smaller power of $j!$. This allows us to conclude weak tractability for sequences

(D_d) with slightly larger radii, i.e., $\mathrm{rad}(D_d) \prec d^{1-\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, while the order of d in $(L_{j,d})$ remains the same. Recall that numerical integration is called *weakly tractable* for $C_d^k(L)$ iff

$$\lim_{d+\varepsilon^{-1}\to\infty} \frac{\ln\, n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(L))}{d+\varepsilon^{-1}} = 0.$$

This means that $n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(L))$ is not exponential in d and in ε^{-1} but can be exponential in d^α or $\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Obviously, the curse of dimensionality implies that weak tractability does not hold. However, the converse statement is not necessarily true, see e.g., [10, 12] for more details.

Proposition 6.4. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets and define $R_d = \mathrm{rad}(D_d)/\sqrt{d}$. Additionally assume that

$$L_{j,d} \,\le\, c\, a^{-j} (j!)^{1-\eta}\; d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}}$$

for all $j, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $a, c, \eta > 0$. Then the information complexity for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ satisfies

$$\ln\bigl(n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L))\bigr) \,\le\, \Bigl(1 + e^{1+1/\eta}(R_d/a)^{2/\eta}\Bigr)\Bigl(1+\ln\frac{c}{\varepsilon}\Bigr)\bigl(1+\ln d\bigr)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$.

In particular, the problem of numerical integration for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ is quasi-polynomially tractable for $R_d \le R < \infty$, and weakly tractable for $R_d \le R d^{1/2-\delta}$, $R < \infty$, $\delta > 0$, and $\eta > 1 - 2\delta$.

Note that the condition on the involved parameter a is weaker than in Proposition 6.3.

Since the proof is again analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.3 and the proof of Proposition 6.3, we omit the details.

Remark 6.5. For function classes with bounds on the partial derivatives the analogue of Proposition 5.4 for $k = \infty$ is also true.

7 Weak and Uniform Weak Tractability

In this section we study the notions of weak and uniform weak tractability and show that the problem is *not* uniformly weakly tractable as long as the bounds $L_{j,d}$ on the Lipschitz constants of the derivatives decay slower than *any* inverse polynomial in d. We prove this result without any additionally condition on the sequence of domains $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ besides $\lambda_d(D_d) = 1$. This is surprising since we already proved polynomial (in d) upper bounds on the information complexity if one $L_{j,d}$ decays (roughly) faster than $d^{-(j+1)/2}$ and the dimension is large enough depending on ε, see Propositions 3.3, 4.8 and 5.3.

The concept of weak tractability was recently strengthened in [15] by introducing the notion of *uniform weak tractability*, which holds for multivariate integration defined over the class $C_d^k(L)$ iff

$$\lim_{d+\varepsilon^{-1}\to\infty} \frac{\ln\, n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(L))}{d^\alpha + \varepsilon^{-\alpha}} = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in (0,1).$$

For uniformly weak tractability, $n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(L))$ is *not exponential* in d^α and $\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Now assume that the double sequence $L = (L_{j,d})_{j,d\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} L_{j,d}\, d^m > 0$$

for all $j \in \{0,1,\ldots,k\}$ and some $m < \infty$. This means that there exists a constant $c > 0$ for which $L_{j,d} \geq c d^{-m}$ for infinitely many d.

We prove that under this condition the problem of numerical integration for the class $\overline{C}_d^k(L)$, see Section 2.2, is not uniformly weakly tractable, independent from the sequence $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$. This also implies that the problem for $C_d^k(L)$ is not uniformly weakly tractable. For this recall the definition of the class $F_{d,k,\delta}$ from [7, Sec. 4]. It follows from the definition of $F_{d,k,\delta}$ that

$$\widetilde{F}_{d,k} := \left\{ f|_{D_d} \;\middle|\; f \in F_{d,k,\delta} \ \text{ for } \ \delta^{-1} = 2\sqrt{18\mathrm{e}\pi} \right\} \subset \overline{C}_d^k(d^m L)$$

for infinitely many $d \in \mathbb{N}$. This leads to

$$n(\varepsilon d^{-m}, C_d^k(L)) \,=\, n(\varepsilon, d^m C_d^k(L)) \,\geq\, n(\varepsilon, C_d^k(d^m L)) \,\geq\, n(\varepsilon, \overline{C}_d^k(d^m L)) \,\geq\, n(\varepsilon, \widetilde{F}_{d,k})$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and infinitely many d. We know from [7, Thm. 2] that the right hand side of this inequality is bounded from below by $(1-\varepsilon)2^d$, see also [7, Remark 1]. We now choose a sequence $(d_i, \varepsilon_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} = (d_i, \frac{1}{2}d_i^{-m})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $\lim_i d_i = \infty$ and $n(\varepsilon_i, C_{d_i}^k(L)) \geq 2^{d_i - 1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The limit in the definition of uniform weak tractability is then lower bounded by

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} \frac{\ln\, n(\frac{1}{2}d^{-m}, C_d^k(L))}{d^\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{2}d^{-m}\right)^{-\alpha}} \;\geq\; \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{(d_i - 1)\ln 2}{d_i^\alpha + 2^\alpha d_i^{\alpha m}} \;>\; 0$$

if we take $\alpha \leq m^{-1}$. This contradicts uniform weak tractability for the classes $C_d^k(L)$ for all finite k.

We now turn to the case $k = \infty$. We prove uniform weak tractability for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ if

$$L_{j,d} \;\leq\; c_d\, j!\, a_d^{-j}\, R_d^{-j-1}\, d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}}$$

for all $j, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $a_d, c_d > 1$ that may depend on d, where $R_d = \mathrm{rad}(D_d)/\sqrt{d}$. The upper bound on the information complexity from Proposition 6.3 (see the last inequality in the proof) implies that

$$\ln n(\varepsilon, C_d^\infty(L)) \le (1+\ln c_d)(1+1/\ln a_d)(1-\ln\varepsilon)(1+\ln d).$$

Plugging this into the definitions of weak and uniform weak tractability we obtain

Theorem 7.1. Let $(D_d)_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of convex sets and define $R_d = \mathrm{rad}(D_d)/\sqrt{d}$. Additionally assume that

$$L_{j,d} \le c_d\, j!\, a_d^{-j}\, R_d^{-j-1}\, d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}} \quad \text{for all } \; j, d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then

- the problem of numerical integration for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ is uniformly weakly tractable if

  $$c_d \le d^m \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_d \ge 1 + 1/(\ln d)^m$$

  for some $m < \infty$,
- the problem of numerical integration for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ is weakly tractable if

  $$c_d \le \exp(d^{b_1}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_d \ge 1 + 1/d^{b_2}$$

  for some $b_1, b_2 \in [0,1)$ with $b_1 + b_2 < 1$.

Theorem 7.1 states, in particular, that weak tractability of numerical integration holds for the unit cube $D_d = (0,1)^d$ and for the classes $C_d^\infty(L)$ if

$$L_{j,d} \le j!\, \big(2 - o_d(1)\big)^j\, d^{-\frac{j+1}{2}}\, \mathrm{e}^{\sqrt{d}}$$

for all $j, d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Acknowledgement. We thank Winfried Sickel for valuable comments and the reference [13]. We thank Jan Vybíral for valuable comments and an early version of his paper [18].

References

[1] N. S. Bakhvalov, On approximate computation of integrals, *Vestnik MGU, Ser. Math. Mech. Astron. Phys. Chem*, **4**, 3–18, 1959, in Russian.

[2] N. S. Bakhvalov, On the optimality of linear methods for operator approximation in convex classes of functions, *USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys.* **11**, 244-249, 1971.

[3] S. Dineen, *Complex Analysis on Infinite Dimensional Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, London, 1999.

[4] G. Elekes, A geometric inequality and the complexity of computing volume, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **1**, 289–292, 1986.

[5] M. C. Delfour, J.-P. Zolésio, Shape analysis via oriented distance functions, *J. Funct. Anal.* **123**, 129–201, 1994.

[6] M. E. Dyer, Z. Füredi, C. McDiarmid, Random volumes in the n-cube. In: Polyhedral combinatorics (Morristown 1989), DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci. vol. 1, 33–38, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence 1990.

[7] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, M. Ullrich, H. Woźniakowski, The curse of dimensionality for numerical integration of smooth functions, *submitted*, 2012.

[8] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, H. Woźniakowski, The curse of dimensionality for the class of monotone functions and for the class of convex functions, *J. Approx. Th.* **163**, 955–965, 2011.

[9] E. Novak, *Deterministic and Stochastic Error Bounds in Numerical Analysis*, LNiM **1349**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.

[10] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of Multivariate Problems*, Volume I: Linear Information, European Math. Soc. Publ. House, Zürich, 2008.

[11] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, Approximation of infinitely differentiable multivariate functions is intractable, *J. Complexity* **25**, 398–404, 2009.

[12] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of Multivariate Problems*, Volume II: Standard Information for Functionals, European Math. Soc. Publ. House, Zürich, 2010.

[13] V. A. Rvachev, Compactly supported solutions of functional-differential equations and their applications, *Russian Math. Surv.* **45**, 87–120, 1990.

[14] Schechtman, G. and Schmuckenschläger, M., Another remark on the volume of the intersection of two L_p^n balls, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1469**, 174–178, 1991.

[15] P. Siedlecki, Uniform weak tractability, *J. Complexity*, to appear.

[16] A. G. Sukharev, Optimal numerical integration formulas for some classes of functions of several variables, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **20**, 472–475, 1979.

[17] J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski and H. Woźniakowski, *Information-Based Complexity*, Academic Press, 1988.

[18] J. Vybíral, Weak and quasi-polynomial tractability of approximation of infinitely differentiable functions, *J. Complexity*, to appear.

[19] O. Wojtaszczyk, Multivariate integration in $C^\infty([0,1]^d)$ is not strongly tractable, *J. Complexity* **19**, 638–643, 2003.